Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 6, 2008.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT

The present reply amends Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, leaving for Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-27. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102.

In the Office Action mailed June 6, 2008, Claims 8-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Broussard et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,912,710, hereafter Broussard).

Claims 8, 15, and 22

Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 8 defines a parser operable to generate a first representation of the at least one deployment descriptor's file; a generator operable to create a second representation of deployment descriptor information based on at least one application source code file associated with the at least one deployment descriptor; a builder operable to compare the first representation with the second representation; wherein the builder automatically updates the first representation to create an updated first representation based on the second representation if the builder determines that the at least one application source code file of the second representation has been modified. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed in or made obvious by Broussard.

Claim 8, as amended, includes two representations: <u>a first representation of the at least one deployment descriptor's file</u>; and <u>a second representation of deployment descriptor information based on at least one application source code file</u> associated with the at least one deployment descriptor. Claim 8 also defines a builder operable to compare the first representation with the second representation. Broussard does not disclose a builder that compares a first representation of the at least one deployment descriptor's file and a second representation of deployment descriptor information based on at least one application source

code file. Instead, Broussard appears to contrast deployment descriptions from the deployment descriptor and object signatures from the application.

Additionally, in Claim 8, the builder <u>automatically updates</u> the first representation to create an updated first representation based on the second representation if the builder determines that the at least one application source code file of the second representation has been modified. Broussard does not perform an update automatically. Instead, Broussard requires user input to confirm differences found between the deployment descriptions and the object signatures. Applicant respectfully submits that Broussard does not disclose or make obvious these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 22 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15 and 22, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11-14, 17-20, and 24-27

Claims 9, 11-14, 17-20, and 24-27 have not been addressed separately. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9, 11-14, 17-20, and 24-27 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9, 11-14, 17-20, and 24-27 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed June 6, 2008, Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,912,710, hereafter Broussard). Claims 6, 10, 16, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard in view of WebLogic Server 6.1: *Developing WebLogic Server J2EE Applications* (hereafter the WebLogic reference).

-8-

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that the GUI can include a user-selectable resource hierarchy, settings pane, message area, and toolbar and wherein when a node in the user-selectable resource hierarchy is selected, at least one field mapping to more than one value in the at least one deployment descriptor is displayed. Applicant respectfully submits that Broussard does not disclose or render obvious these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 16, and 23

Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 16, and 23 have not been addressed separately. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 16, and 23 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 16, and 23 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 8, 2008   By: /Nathan L. Feld/
                                  Nathan L. Feld
                                  Reg. No. 59725

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800